

THREE ARMENIAN SOUND LAWS

ERIC P. HAMP
University of Chicago

ARMENIAN *UL* 'KID'

I have proposed (*Glossologia* [Athens] 2-3, 1983-1984, 163-8) on the basis of a canvass of Greek that in absolute final position IE

1. *liquid + laryngeal in zero-grade imparted a preceding **o* vocalization in pre-Greek; and then
2. *laryngeal was realized as lengthening of the vowel preceding the liquid.

Then later prehistoric suffixations, which were obligatory in the case of *-λ, concealed the fact that these developments happened regularly in final position.

Of the twelve instances that support my argument a notable case is πῶλος 'foal, filly'. I derive πῶλος as a later thematization from **plH*, which is also the base of the derivation which forms the Germanic etymon of English *foal* and the etymon of Albanian *pelë* 'mare' and of Welsh *elein*, pl. *alaned* 'doe, fawn'. The same base gives an Albanian verb *piell* 'give birth'.

It has long been claimed that Armenian *ul* is cognate with

πῶλος¹ I have clarified (*Journal of Turkish Studies: An Anniversary Volume in Honor of Francis Woodman Cleaves* 9, 1985, 133-5) the appearance of *h-* and zero in Armenian as the reflexes of IE **p-*; in that study I find the cognacy of *ul* to be perfectly acceptable.

This means that the development of **plH > *polH > *pōl* was shared by Greek and Armenian.

ARMENIAN ARMUKN 'ELBOW'

I have discussed this word *JIES* 10, 1982, 188-9, where I concluded (188) "that Arm. *armukn* is a derivative of the *ani* base seen in Greek ἄρμος, ἀρμίσκω, Arm. *ārnem*, etc." R.S.P. Beekes has reconstructed (*Die Laryngaltheorie*, ed. A. Bammesberger, Heidelberg: Winter 1988, 78) **ArHmo-muHsm*. I have pointed out (loc. cit.) that the sequence cannot be **ArH-*. Yet I think now Beekes's form with a first member suffixed in **-mo-* a good hypothesis, especially because it is semantically and radically invariant from the IE point of view.

However, a **-mō-* formation in any case would call for an 0-grade². Therefore I propose **AorHmo-muHsm* → **AerHmo-muHsm* (cf. *ĵerm*, KZ96, 171 ff.) > **aramomuH(s)m* > **aramumuHn* > **arumukn* (syllabic haplology) > *armukn* (regular syncope). Because the **A* here fails to appear as Arm. *h-* it must have been IE **h = h⁴*; this did not colour an adjacent **o*, and therefore the **e* vocalism is to be assumed³.

Correcting *JIES* 10, we now see that we have reflexes of IE

1. Meillet, *Esquisse* 48, attaches to this *am-ul* 'sterile', with the important *-m-*; and *yti* 'pregnant', which must be a later derivative, one based on **ōl-*.

2. E.P. Hamp, KZ 96, 1982-83, 171-7. Note also the remarks on zero-grade and 'arm' at 175.

3. The **e* vocalism here and in Lat. *armus* seems cheaper than the irregular loss of Arm. *h-*.

'arm' in Indo-Iranian, Armenian, Balto-Slavic, Germanic, and Latin.

IE *RHC IN ARMENIAN

Beekes correctly credits (*Die Laryngaltheorie*, ed. A. Bammesberger, Heidelberg: Winter 1988, 78) *ana* and *ata* in *canac'em* 'know' and *atač'em* 'ask' to **ġnO-sk-* and **slA-sk-*; I would write **ġnA^w-sk-* and **slA-sk-*. See my formulation, *Études in memoriam Haig Berbérian*, ed. D. Kouymjian, Lisbon: Gulbenkian, 1986, 293, and *AALing.* 6, 1985, 52; the corresponding outcome for **r* is *aṛa*.

Beekes is undecided whether *CaRawC* is another development; I think the answer is in the affirmative. *canawt'* 'known' must be < **ġnA^w-t-*, and *atawt'k'* 'prayer' < **slA-ti-*. Whether *nawt'i* 'sober, jejune' is **n'dti(o)-* is a little less clear in detail although this must be put in equivalence with *νήστις*, and thus reflect **n-'t-ti-*. In all of these the laryngeal appears to have left behind the *w* segment before the (perhaps ultima) stop, in these cases dental.

It seems that we may find within Armenian a plausible phonetic motivation for this outcome. Recall that **septm* yields *ewt'n*. Recall too that **p* yields besides *w* (no doubt via **φ*), both *h* and zero (via **φ* next to rounded vowel); cf. my study, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 9, 1985, 133-5. At one stage, then, **p* had the value [*φ* ~ *h*]. We need only assume that at that time the **h* which had (e)merged from the laryngeal non-syllabics was overtaken by the successors to **p*, and developed contextually to *w*. At the same time the **t* was protected by the spirant.